

A

0000358671



**THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AND CHRISTIAN TEACHING
IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS. ==**

A CORRESPONDENCE,
CARRIED ON BY
LAWRENCE STERNER,
IN THE INTEREST OF
THE SCIENCE OF
UNIVERSAL EDU-
CATION, WITH THE
BISHOP OF LONDON,
HIS CLERGY, AND,
FINALLY, WITH
THE ARCHBISHOP
OF CANTERBURY.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AND CHRISTIAN TEACHING
IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AND CHRISTIAN TEACHING
IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS. . . .

A CORRESPONDENCE CARRIED
ON BY LAWRENCE STERNER,
IN THE INTEREST OF THE
SCIENCE OF UNIVERSAL
EDUCATION, WITH THE BISHOP
OF LONDON, HIS CLERGY,
AND, FINALLY, WITH THE
ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

PREFACE.

To the Fellows of the Royal Society, the Members of the Board of Education, and others who are responsible for Public Education.

May 25th 1912.

The following correspondence—consisting of my 53 letters of inquiry concerning “the specific and authoritative *teaching* of the Church” and the 28 letters of reply received from the Bishop of London, his clergy, and, finally, from the Archbishop of Canterbury—is submitted to you, *in its entirety*, with his Grace’s tacit consent (although 3 of the replies were marked “Private”) for your careful study and consideration.

At the Centenary Meeting of THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING EDUCATION IN THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CHURCH, held at the Mansion House, on Mch 24th 1911, the Archbishop of Canterbury moved that “*definite Religious instruction, as an integral part of Education, is of vital*

consequence to the National Welfare" and declared that "*Religion must lie at the centre and root of National Education.*" The Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour, M.P.,—as leader of the Unionist Party, representing about one half of the electors of Great Britain,—seconded the motion and spoke in emphatic concurrence with his Grace's declaration.

HIS MAJESTY'S DECLARATION, prefixed to the "*ARTICLES agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, and the whole Clergy,*" in the year 1562, "*for the avoiding of Diversities of Opinions and for the establishing of Consent touching true Religion,*" clearly defines that those Articles "*do contain the true doctrine of the Church of England agreeable to God's Word*" and that,—in order "*not to suffer unnecessary Disputations, Altercations, or Questions to be raised, which may nourish Faction both in the Church and Commonwealth,*"—"the least difference" or "*any varying or departing in the least degree*" from their "*literal and grammatical sense,*" is, under Penalty, prohibited within the British Realm.

The answers which were sent me appear to shew that *whereas little children are definitely instructed to affirm "THE FOUNDATION TRUTH" of Religion (i.e. "Christ is God") "AS BUT HALF THE TRUTH"; yet those children are not definitely instructed that, as further appears from those answers: "the unqualified statement CHRIST is GOD" is an improper, loose, incorrect application of the name and title CHRIST; is nowhere found in Holy*

Scripture or the Creeds of the Church; is used by the Clergy when they are not speaking as officials of "the Church" in "technical theological language," but when they are speaking as "Christians" in the admittedly inaccurate "language of religion and worship" or "popular religion"; is a final dictum which (as stated by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his answer of Apl 2nd 1910) "neither the Archbishop of Canterbury nor anyone else can, of his own authority, give," and is justified (according to his Grace, in the same answer) by "a wide variety of opinion as to the due interpretation of the teachings of Holy Scripture upon great questions" which "the Church allows" to her Ministers, when such latitude stands in direct violation of the express provisions in His Majesty's Declaration.

It will be seen that I twice appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as head of the Church, in a simple inquiry numbered 3 (contained in my letters of Mch 31st and May 25th 1910) to give me, personally or by proxy, *definite assurance that little children are in no way misled by being equivocally taught, as "THE FOUNDATION TRUTH" of "RELIGION," an unqualified statement that is admittedly inaccurate, half the truth, unauthorised and evidently interdicted, and that his Grace after at first (Apl. 2nd 1910) evading a reply, finally (May 28th 1910) signified he must leave me without that assurance.*

My contention is that neither the Archbishop of Canterbury, nor Mr. Balfour, nor, indeed, the

President of the Board of Education* is either willing or able to give that assurance.

In the interest of the child, by the proper education of which not only the National Welfare, but the Peaceful Progress of Civilization must, in the future, be ensured, it would be gratifying to find that the specific assurance, twice denied me by the Archbishop of Canterbury, will be *publicly* forthcoming.

LAWRENCE STERNER.

* The Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman, M.P., while President of the Board of Education, in answer to several letters of inquiry, wrote me that he "attaches great importance to instruction in the Principles of the Christian Religion"; but that he was unable to say "Religion" is the Board's basis of National Education "without qualification." Though I repeatedly asked him to "state the Board's basis of National Education *in precise terms*," he steadily refused to do so.

ERRATA :

- Page 63. Last line should read: "religion, the reverse of those statements."
- Page 66. Second paragraph, first two lines should read:
 "The Church does not invariably hold and teach: JESUS CHRIST is *never* GOD only; JESUS CHRIST is *not* GOD Himself;"
- Page 77. Last paragraph, fifth line, should read:
 "of the Bishop of London's Chaplain,"

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND CHRISTIAN TEACHING IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

I.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

May 28th 08.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

May I ask to be kindly informed whether the Church of England holds and teaches the doctrine that "CHRIST is GOD"?

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

II.

Fulham Palace, S.W.

May 30th 08.

Dear Sir:

I think a reference to the Nicene Creed in the service of the Holy Communion leaves no doubt as to the Church's teaching on the Divinity of

CHRIST. "I believe in one LORD JESUS CHRIST, the only begotten Son of GOD, Begotten of his Father before all Worlds: GOD of GOD, Light of Light, very GOD of very GOD, Begotten not made, being *of one substance with the Father*.

I am ys. v truly
M. P. GILLSON.
Chaplain.

III.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.
June 4th 08.

To the Rt. Rev.
the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

I thank you for your most gracious letter of May 30th, conveyed to me by your Chaplain, in which you refer me to the Nicene Creed for evidence of the Divinity of Christ, but I regret to say this does not give me the information sought.

My inquiry was with reference to the affirmation that "CHRIST is GOD."

Will you pardon me, therefore, if I put my question more clearly:

Does the Established Church of England teach that "CHRIST is GOD" or that "CHRIST is not GOD"?

Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

IV.

Private.

Fulham Palace, S.W.

June 5th.

Dear Sir

I chose the statement as to the Divinity of CHRIST from the Nicene Creed simply because I thought it stated far more clearly and certainly with far greater authority than I could the fact that the Church has everywhere and at all times taught the foundation truth of our faith that CHRIST is GOD. You will find it stated in all the three Creeds, particularly in that of S. Athanasius. I need hardly say that those three Creeds are all held by the Church of England.

I have marked this letter private simply meaning that I do not wish it published.

I am yours v truly,

M. P. GILLSON.

Chaplain.

V.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

June 8th 08.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

I beg to thank you for your most gracious reply to my letter of the 4th inst., conveyed to me

through your Chaplain, and note that it is not for publication.

You write that I will find the "foundation truth" of the Church's faith that "CHRIST is GOD" stated in all the three Creeds—particularly in that of S. Athanasius.

I have all the three Creeds before me: the Apostles' Creed; the Nicene Creed; and the Athanasian Creed.

Taking up first the Apostles' Creed,—the earliest of the Christian Creeds (attributed to the Apostles, is it not?) I am unable to discover therein stated this "foundation truth." Will you kindly, therefore, point out to me where, in the Apostles' Creed, I am to find the "foundation truth" enunciated that "CHRIST is GOD."

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

VI.

Fulham Palace
S.W.

June 10th

Dear Sir

I fear my letters seem to be of very little use to you partly perhaps because I cannot make out exactly what you want to know: you started with enquiring the Church's belief as to the Divinity of CHRIST and you now ask for an explanation of the Apostles Creed: I would suggest your reading the

Bishop of Birmingham's last book: "The New Theology and the Old Religion" pubd Murray: he has at least one chapter on the point you write about and the whole book is most excellent and well worth reading.

I am, yours v truly

M. P. GILLSON.

Chaplain.

VII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

June 13th 08.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

I have again to thank you for your letter of the 10th inst., conveyed to me through your Chaplain, and for your kind interest in referring me to the Bishop of Birmingham's last book. But if you will be good enough to turn to my letters you will not find that I ever enquired with regard to "the Church's belief as to the Divinity of CHRIST." I clearly and explicitly sought information only as to whether the Church held and taught that "CHRIST is GOD."

Neither did I, in my last letter, ask for "an explanation of the Apostles Creed."

In a previous letter you informed me that the Church of England did hold and teach that

"CHRIST is GOD" adding that this was "the foundation truth" of the Church's faith and I would "find it stated in all the three Creeds."

I, naturally, thereupon, turned to the Creeds, and, failing to see this "foundation truth" stated in the first one—the Apostles' Creed,—I enquired of you where I should find it in this Creed.

I am sorry therefore that I have again to ask you to point out to me where, in the Apostles' Creed, I am to find "the foundation truth" stated that "CHRIST is GOD."

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

VIII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park,

N.W.

June 27th 08.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

May I hope to be favoured with a reply to my letter of the 13th inst., inquiring where, in the Apostles' Creed, I am to find "the foundation truth" stated that "CHRIST is GOD," as directed by your Lordship in your letter of June 5th.

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

IX.

Christchurch Albany St.
The Clergy House,
156, Albany St. N.W.

Dear Sir, July 1st 1908

The Bishop of London's Chaplain has written me to say that you have been in correspondence with the Bishop about religious matters. You will understand that it is impossible for the Bishop, overworked as he is, to deal personally with your inquiries, and so I have been asked, as one of the clergy of this parish, to put myself at your disposal.

If you would care to come and have a talk with me, I shall be free on Friday evening next after 8.30, and I shall be glad then to be of such use to you as I can. I don't of course pretend that I shall be able to solve all your doubts, but at least I can assure you that I shall meet your difficulties with sympathy, whatever they may be. So if you think I may possibly be of some use to you, do come and see me.

Yours truly.

EDWARD PACE.

X.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

The Rev. Edward Pace. July 2nd 08.

Dear Sir:

I beg to thank you for your very kind letter and shall be pleased to call at 9.30 to-morrow,

Friday, evening with regard to my correspondence with the Bishop of London.

I regret I am not able to come earlier, but shall not detain you more than a few minutes.

Yours faithfully,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XI.

The Studio,

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park,

N.W.

July 4th 08.

The Rev. Edward Pace.

Dear Sir :

In confirmation of the interview which you accorded me at the Bishop of London's request, I understand you to have said that you do not regard the Bishop's letter,—in which he wrote me that I would find the foundation truth of the Church's faith that CHRIST is GOD “stated in all the three Creeds, particularly in that of S. Athanasius,”—as being “strictly accurate”; that, truly, the absolute statement that CHRIST is GOD is not to be found either in the Bible, the Apostles' Creed or the Nicene Creed; but is only to be found in the Athanasian Creed wherein the words “the SON is GOD” actually and alone appear.

I am,

Yours faithfully,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XII.

156, Albany Street, N.W.

July 6th 1908

Dear Sir,

In reply to your letter I should say that the Bishop's letter was not strictly accurate as regards *the exact words* "Christ is God." But of course in a matter of religious belief it is the doctrine rather than the words which is important, and I should say that the doctrine that Christ is God is to be inferred from the Apostles' Creed, is enforced most emphatically in the Nicene, and is stated, almost in the words given by the Bishop, in the Athanasian Creed. Further it is undoubtedly the Church's faith that Christ is God, though the expression of that article of faith may vary greatly.

As regards Biblical statements about the Divinity of Christ you might refer to St. John's Gospel. The opening words are: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and *the Word was God.*"

"The Word" is a title of Christ. I trust that this is clear.

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD PACE.

P.S.—An eloquent statement of the argument for the Divinity of Christ is to be found in Liddon's Bampton Lectures. Bishop Westcott's "Historic Faith," wh. you can get for six-

pence in Macmillan's Series, is an explanation of the Apostles' Creed in a more popular form by one of the greatest of Christian scholars. The latter would be of more use to you than Liddon's work probably, and certainly than the book of Gore wh. was recommended to you, since I understand that your purpose is in no way controversial but that you wish to have a clear statement of what Christians do believe.

In Westcott's book you will find that, in a form both simple and philosophical.

XIII.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.
July 10th 1908.

To the Rev. Edward Pace.

Dear Sir:—

I beg to thank you for your letter of the 6th inst., and your recommendation of books for my guidance.

I now clearly understand from you that the exact words "CHRIST is GOD" are not to be found anywhere, either in the Bible or in any of the three Creeds.

But though *the words* are nowhere in evidence, yet you wish me to understand that *the doctrine* that "CHRIST is GOD" is stated in the Bible as "the word was God"; that it "is to be inferred" from the Apostles' Creed; is "enforced most emphatically" in the Nicene Creed; and that, in the

Athanasian Creed "The Father is GOD, the Son of GOD: and the Holy Ghost is GOD" is to be regarded as "almost" the same as "CHRIST is GOD."

It appears therefore that the exact words "CHRIST is GOD" emanate originally from the Church, or have been adopted by the Church from sources other than the Bible or Creeds, I can only suppose for the purpose of giving expression to this particular article of its faith.

But you say, in your letter, that the Church does not regard *the words* "CHRIST is GOD" so much as *the doctrine* that "CHRIST is GOD" as being of importance. Do not *the words* "CHRIST is GOD" accurately express *the doctrine* that "CHRIST is GOD"? And may I ask what *words* are necessary in order to give accurate expression to the Church's *doctrine* that "CHRIST is GOD"?

I am,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XIV.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

July 16th 08.

The Rev. Edward Pace.

Dear Sir:

I should be glad to be favoured with the information sought in my letter of July 10th as to what

words are necessary in order to give accurate expression to the Church's doctrine that "CHRIST is GOD."

I am,

Yours faithfully,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XV.

156, Albany St. N.W.

July 17, 1908

Dear Sir,

In answer to your letters of the 10th and 16th I should say that the most careful and accurate statement of the doctrine that Christ is God is to be found in the second half of the Athanasian Creed, beginning at the words: "For the right faith is, that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is GOD and Man, etc."

At the same time you must be prepared to find that there are many sincere Christians who have a living faith in Jesus as a Divine Saviour, who yet would be unable to give expression to their belief in the language of dogma, and might easily if questioned use words which might give rise to misconception. Accurate expression, such as that of the Nicene or Athanasian Creed, is necessary for the transmission of a doctrine from age to age, but the vital faith, which may be almost inarticulate, is what affects individual life and character.

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD PACE.

XVI.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park,
N.W.

The Rev. Edward Pace. July 18th 08.

Dear Sir :

I thank you for your letter of yesterday's date. I have read and re-read the second part of the Athanasian Creed (beginning at the words: "For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God is GOD and MAN, etc.,") to which you refer me for the most careful and accurate statement of the Church's doctrine that "CHRIST is GOD."

I cannot find any such statement.

I can only find the statement that CHRIST is "GOD and MAN" which is repeated and thoroughly insisted upon.

Will you kindly say if you wish me to understand that when the Church says "CHRIST is GOD" it means "CHRIST is GOD and MAN."

I am,

Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

XVII.

156, Albany Street, N.W.

My dear Sir, July 22nd

By the statement that Christ is both God and Man, the Church undoubtedly means that Christ

is God and also that Christ is Man, the two natures being united in one Person. This is the historical meaning and I should say the natural meaning of the words "Christ is both God and Man."

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD PACE.

XVIII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

July 23rd 08.

The Rev. Edward Pace.

Dear Sir:

I thank you for your letter of yesterday, which, unfortunately, does not, in any way, reply to my inquiry.

The statement that CHRIST is both GOD and MAN (according to the Athanasian Creed) is quite comprehensive, and I asked for no explanation as to its meaning. The words themselves clearly convey their meaning, which seems to me to be right and as it should be.

The *unqualified* statement that "CHRIST is GOD" is quite another matter. It is not to be found in the Bible or Creeds. It is not comprehensive, the words do not clearly express their meaning: you yourself—in your letter of the 6th inst.,—suggested that these words "CHRIST is

GOD " were not so important as the meaning attached to them.

I asked you for this important meaning.

You referred me to the Athanasian Creed, which contains no *unqualified* statement that "CHRIST is GOD"; but on the contrary, carefully explains that CHRIST is *both* GOD *and* MAN.

I am therefore bound again to ask: When the Church makes the *unqualified* statement that "CHRIST is GOD" does it mean to convey that CHRIST is both GOD and MAN? If not, will you kindly vouchsafe to inform me what the Church *does* mean to convey when it makes the *unqualified* statement that "CHRIST is GOD"?

I am,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XIX.

156 Albany St. N.W.

July 27. 1908

My dear Sir,

I am afraid our correspondence is likely to go on indefinitely as I do not seem to succeed at all in satisfying you. But I make one more attempt.

The Church believes that in the unity of the Godhead there are three Persons, each of whom is eternally God. As the Athanasian Creed puts it: The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. St. John states part of the doctrine when he says, in the first verse of his Gospel "The word, (i.e. the Son) was God." Further the Son, we believe, became incarnate and Jesus is the In-

carnate Son. Christ is really a translation of the Hebrew term Messiah, and the title implies our belief that Jesus fulfilled the hopes which centred in the Jewish conception of the Messiah. Jesus is the human personal name and Christ an official title connected with his manhood. Jesus Christ is both God and Man, Godhead and Humanity being united in the Incarnation never to be separated. The name Jesus Christ is not properly applicable to the Son until the Incarnation and that explains why you will not find in the Creeds the unqualified statement that *Christ* is God. Sometimes, of course, when we are not speaking in technical theological language we use the word "Christ" to designate the Second Person of the Trinity, but strictly it should be applied only to Him as incarnate. The first part of the Athanasian Creed refers to the eternal mystery of the Trinity, and therefore states that the Son is God; the second refers to the Incarnation and therefore states that Jesus Christ is God and Man. St. John makes the same statements: "The Word was God" cp. I v. i. and "The Word was made flesh," cp. I v. 14. You will find yet another statement of the eternal Godhead of the Son, and of the two natures of the Son incarnate in Jesus Christ, in the 2nd Article of the Church of England. The articles of Religion are to be found at the end of the Prayer Book.

I do trust I have succeeded in answering your questions this time.

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD PACE.

XX.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

August 1st 08.

The Rev. Edward Pace.

Dear Sir :

Thank you for your very kind letter of the 27th inst., explaining the Church's belief. I am not sure I understand how you intend it to apply to *the unqualified statement that "CHRIST is GOD,"* which is the subject of my inquiry.

- 1.—You state: "Jesus Christ is both God and Man: Godhead and Humanity being united in the Incarnation never to be separated."

Do you wish me to understand by this that the *unqualified* statement "CHRIST is GOD" is wrong, because it *does* separate the Godhead of CHRIST from the Humanity of CHRIST?

- 2.—You state: "The name Jesus Christ is not properly applicable to the Son until the Incarnation and that explains why you will not find in the Creeds the unqualified statement that *Christ* is God."

Do you wish me to understand by this that the *unqualified* statement that "CHRIST is GOD" is not to be found in the Creeds because it is not a correct statement: because CHRIST is never Spirit alone; but always Spirit and flesh?

3.—You state: "Sometimes, of course, when we are not speaking in technical theological language, we use the word 'Christ' to designate the Second Person of the Trinity, but strictly it should be applied only to Him as Incarnate."

Do you wish me to understand by this:

- (1) That, strictly, CHRIST is never the Second Person of the Trinity: never "the Son"; but only "*the Son incarnate*." That, therefore, the *unqualified* statement that "CHRIST is GOD" is not a correct expression of the truth?
- (2) That, the *unqualified* statement that "CHRIST is GOD" is never used when speaking in technical theological language?
- (3) That the correct technical theological expression of the truth is not the *unqualified* statement that "CHRIST is GOD"; but the qualified statement that CHRIST is GOD, the SON, Incarnate, or, in other words, CHRIST is GOD and MAN?

I should feel obliged if you will set me right on each of these points separately and in the order I have put them down.

I am,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXI.

156, Albany St. N.W.

Aug 5th 1908.

Dear Sir,

In answering your letter may I make first one or two general remarks: (1) What is not expressed in any statement is not thereby denied. (2) A statement may therefore be incomplete without being wrong. (3) We are throughout dealing with a Person and not merely a Name.

As to your specific enquiries:

- 1.—The unqualified statement "Christ is God" is not wrong but uncompleted.
- 2.—This question turns on the confusion between Person and Name, as well as that between an incomplete and an incorrect statement. If "Christ is God" meant that "Christ (i.e. the Person Jesus Christ) is God *and God only*" it would be incorrect. But omission is not denial.
- 3.—(1) If in your question you mean by "Christ" the *Person* in whom we believe, my answer is No. If you are asking about the application of the *name* or *title* Christ (wh. means, as I said, Messiah) then it is not correct to apply it to the Second Person of the Trinity, except as Incarnate.

(2) In technical theological language the unqualified statement "Christ is God" would never be used if the theologian had any reason to suppose that his hearers or readers would

be inclined to take omission for denial, as you seem to do.

(3) If you will substitute in your statement "complete" for "correct," my answer is "Yes."

I am going away for my holiday early on Monday and so I must now bring this correspondence to a close.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD PACE.

XXII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Aug 8th 08.

The Rev. Edward Pace.

Dear Sir :

I am in receipt of your favour of the 5th inst., replying generally and specifically to the questions contained in my last letter, and note that you write you "must now bring this correspondence to a close."

In conclusion, I think I am right in stating that, from your several communications, you clearly wish me to understand the following facts regarding the *unqualified* statement "CHRIST is GOD."

- 1.—The *unqualified* statement "CHRIST is GOD" is nowhere to be found in the Bible or any of the three Creeds in use in the Church.

- 2.—The *unqualified* statement "CHRIST is GOD" is "uncompleted," that is, not the whole truth.
- 3.—The whole truth is not the unqualified statement "CHRIST is GOD"; but the qualified statement "CHRIST is GOD the SON *incarnate*" or, in other words, "CHRIST is GOD and MAN."

It only remains for me to thank you, finally, for the great trouble you have taken to inform me on this subject.

I am,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXIII.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

Aug 14th 08.

To the Rt. Rev.
the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

The Rev. Edward Pace, to whom your Lordship referred me for more complete information with regard to the Church's doctrine that "CHRIST is GOD" has given me to understand in his correspondence, which he has just terminated, that the *unqualified* affirmation "CHRIST is GOD" is nowhere to be found in the Bible or the three Creeds

in use in the Church; but is an "uncompleted" statement.

Your Lordship will remember that, in your communication of June 5th, you informed me: "the Church has everywhere and at all times taught the foundation truth of our faith that "CHRIST is GOD."

Does your Lordship desire me to understand that "the foundation truth" of the Church is nowhere to be found in the Bible or Creeds; but is an "uncompleted" statement, that is,—not the whole truth?

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXIV.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Aug 31st 08.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

I should feel greatly obliged if you would kindly favour me with a reply to my letter of the 14th inst.

I am,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXV.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.
Sept 16th 08.

To the Rt. Rev.
the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

I beg to call your attention to the fact that both my letters of Aug 14th and 31st (with reference to your Lordship's and the Rev. Edward Pace's communications) remain unanswered.

I trust your Lordship will favour me with your reply at your earliest convenience.

I am,
Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXVI.

Fulham Palace, S.W.
Sept. 19.

Dear Sir

I thought I made it clear when I asked Mr. Pace to be so kind as to call and see you that, so far as I am concerned this correspondence is closed: please be so kind as to understand this now.

I am, yours v truly
M, P, GILLSON.

XXVII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Sept. 23rd 08.

The Rev. M. P. Gillson.

Sir:

I regret to say your letter of the 19th is not clear.

Is it intended to convey to me the Bishop of London's views and wishes with regard to my correspondence with *him*?

Kindly let me know.

Yours faithfully,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXVIII.

Fulham Palace, S.W.

Sept. 24.

Dear Sir

I have replied to all your letters and unless the Bishop saw the first about which I am not sure he has seen none of them. I should really be grateful to be relieved from continuing this correspondence.

Ys v truly

M. P. GILLSON.

XXIX.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Sept 29th 08.

The Rev. M. P Gillson,
Chaplain.

Sir:

There is no mention in any of your communications either that you were answering my letters,—addressed to the Bishop of London,—at the Bishop's request, or that you were doing so upon your own initiative. This omission on your part naturally left me to believe that I was all along in direct communication with the Bishop himself.

Since, however, I only seek special and accurate information with regard to the use, by the Church, of the *unqualified* affirmation "CHRIST IS GOD," it is not of so grave importance *who* my informant is, as that I can rely upon the *accuracy and authority* of the information received. It was upon this consideration alone that I took the liberty of humbly addressing myself to the Fulham Palace—to the Bishop of London.

You will pardon my feeling that the Bishop himself would more readily have put me in possession of the information I sought without the need of this rather lengthy and somewhat tortuous correspondence. Why both yourself and the Rev. Edward Pace (to whom you referred me) should have arbitrarily closed your correspondence, after apparently exhibiting a certain unwillingness to

yield me the full information I want upon the subject, is not clear to me.

I would ask you, therefore, to kindly lay my letter of Aug 14th before the Bishop, in order that his Lordship may be allowed to determine whether the information therein asked of him should, without reason, be denied me.

I am,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXX.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Oct 9th 08.

The Rev. M. P. Gillson,
Chaplain.

Sir :

As I have not had any reply to my letter of Aug 14th, addressed to the Bishop of London, I should be glad to know whether you have placed this communication in his Lordship's hands in accordance with my recent request.

I am so very desirous to have light upon the subject of my original inquiry as soon as possible.

I am,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER,

XXXI.

(Postcard.)

Fulham Palace, S.W.

Oct. 12.

I have unfortunately not kept any of your letters so cannot lay them before the Bishop.

Yours

M. P. GILLSON.

XXXII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Oct 14th 08.

The Rev. M. P Gillson,
Chaplain.

Sir :

I beg to enclose you a copy of my letter of Aug 14th addressed to the Bishop of London which will enable you to lay it before him.

I am anxious to have accurate and authoritative information as to what the Church desires me to understand on the subject therein contained.

I am,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXXIII.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.
Oct 24th 08.

The Rev. M. P Gillson,
Chaplain.

Sir :

Did you receive the copy of my letter of Aug 14th which I sent you immediately upon receipt of your postcard of the 12th inst., and if so, will you kindly let me know whether you have now laid this communication before the Bishop of London ?

It is of the utmost importance that I should not be left in ignorance with regard to the Church's use of the *unqualified* and—according to your representative, the Rev. Edward Pace—"uncompleted" statement "CHRIST is GOD."

I am,

Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXXIV.

London House.
32, S. James's Square, S.W.
Oct. 27.

Dear Sir

I did receive your copy of a letter written Aug 14 and did lay it before the Bishop.

I am,

Ys v truly

M. P. GILLSON.

XXXV.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

Nov. 17th 08.

To the Rt. Rev.
the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

Your Chaplain wrote me on Oct 27th that he had laid before you the copy which I sent him of my letter of Aug 14th addressed to your Lordship. I have been hoping to be favoured with a reply.

Mr. Gillson has, doubtless, explained to you his unfortunate omission by which I was led to believe, until quite recently, that the letters I received from the Palace, since last May, were written by your dictation, and also that the Rev. Edward Pace was delegated by you to elucidate the Church's affirmation "CHRIST is GOD."

It has become a matter of wonder and serious concern to me to have learned from Mr. Pace's letter of Aug 5th that the unqualified statement "CHRIST is GOD" is "uncompleted"; and from Mr Gillson's letter of June 5th that this statement is "the foundation truth" of the Church's faith.

Since both of these Reverend gentlemen have expressed, most strangely it seems to me, a determination to arbitrarily close further communication, I am left totally in the dark as to what they desire me to understand by their apparent information that "*the foundation of truth*" of the Church's faith is "*uncompleted*."

Your Lordship, I feel sure, would wish that every opportunity should be afforded me to receive all possible light on the subject, and I therefore trust this may be granted me.

I am, my lord,
Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXXVI.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

To the Rt. Rev. Dec 4th 08.
the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

I beg to call your attention to the fact that my letter of Nov 17th, addressed to your Lordship, remains unanswered.

I am, my lord,
Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXXVII.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

To the Rt. Rev. Dec 15th 08.
the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

I am at a loss to understand why my letter of Nov 17th, to which I had occasion to draw your

Lordship's attention on Dec 4th, still remains unanswered.

Fearing I may have mis-stated the information given me by your Chaplain and the Rev. Edward Pace regarding the Church's affirmation "CHRIST is GOD," I have again referred to their communications and find that :

On June 5th Mr. Gillson wrote :

"—— the Church has everywhere and at all times taught the foundation truth of our faith that CHRIST is GOD."

On Aug 5th Mr. Pace wrote :

"The unqualified statement 'Christ is God' is not wrong but uncompleted."

I earnestly beg that your Lordship will yield me some official light upon these utterances, or will kindly say to whom I should apply for authoritative information thereon.

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXXVIII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Dec 22nd 08.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop :

It is with regret I find myself obliged to ask your Lordship to kindly give me your reason for not

replying to my letters of Aug 14th, Nov 17th, Dec 4th and Dec 15th, in which I invoked authoritative explanation of the religious statements made, on behalf of the Church, by your Chaplain and the Rev. Edward Pace.

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XXXIX.

(Registered Letter.)

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Jany 9th 09.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop :

I trust your Lordship will not be pleased to continue to ignore all my recent communications. I cannot readily believe that the action of your representatives in arbitrarily closing the door of religious information, has your Lordship's sanction; and that, without reason, you yourself are unwilling to assist me in obtaining any authoritative elucidation of the particular statements which I had the honour of quoting to your Lordship.

Should, however, such a painful conclusion be forced upon me, you would leave, it seems, but

one step open to me, namely, that of addressing His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury on the subject.

Much as I should deplore the necessity of so doing, should I not hear from you by the end of next week I shall have no alternative but to understand that your Lordship prefers me to adopt this course.

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XL.

Bickenham,

(Till Jan. 23rd) Cavendish Place.

Bournemouth.

Jan. 12. 09

Dear Sir—

The Bishop of London trusts you will excuse his having forgotten, amongst his numerous letters, the statements of which you require elucidation. The Bishop's private Secretary is not with him at present, but should you wish to write on the subject to his Lordship again, he will endeavour to satisfy you.

Yrs. v. truly

ERIC. K. C. HAMILTON (Ad. Sec.)

XLI.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Jany 20th 09.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

In compliance with your Lordship's request, contained in your esteemed favour of the 12th inst., I once more lay before you the following particular statements of your representatives:

Mr. Gillson informed me on June 5th:

"—— the Church has everywhere and at all times taught the foundation truth of our faith that CHRIST is GOD."

Mr. Pace informed me on Aug 5th:

"The unqualified statement 'Christ is God' is not wrong but uncompleted."

It is not clear in what light the Church regards a "foundation truth" that is "uncompleted."

Is it a universally established doctrine of the Church that "the foundation truth" of its faith is "uncompleted"?

And how, may I venture to ask, are little children led by the Church to understand that the affirmation "CHRIST is GOD" is "uncompleted"?

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XLII

Bournemouth

Jan. 22. 1909.

Dear Sir.

The Bishop asks me to acknowledge your letter. The statement that 'Christ is God' is, of course, incomplete because it is but half the truth. From eternity Christ is God, but for 1900 years He is likewise Man. Hence to complete the truth the Church teaches that the Second Person of the Trinity is God *and* Man, "equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, but inferior as touching his Manhood," "yet He is not two, but one Christ." The Bishop hopes this answer will prove satisfactory to you.

Yours truly

B. G. BOURCHIER,

Acting-Chaplain.

XLIII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Feby 3rd 09.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

Although extremely thankful for your communication of the 22nd ulto., I regret it does not refer to the specific information sought. Your Lordship does not say whether the statement "CHRIST is

GOD" is universally taught by the Church as but "half the truth"; or how little children are instructed to affirm "CHRIST is GOD" as but "half the truth."

You are pleased to staté: "From eternity Christ is God, but for 1900 years He is likewise Man." Does the Church teach that CHRIST is *never* GOD only; but is always GOD and MAN?

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XLIV.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Feby 18th 09.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

I trust my letter of the 3rd inst. duly reached you and that I may be favoured with the information asked.

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XLV.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

To the Rt. Rev.

Feby 25th 09.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

I beg to call your attention to my letters of Feby 3rd and 18th to neither of which have I received any acknowledgment.

Your Lordship affirmed in your communication of Jan'y 22nd that the statement "CHRIST is GOD" is "but half the truth." This merely ratified that which your representative, the Rev. Edward Pace, had already informed me, namely, that it is "uncompleted." What I desired to know and asked was:

Does the Church universally *teach* that the statement "CHRIST is GOD" is "but half the truth"; and are little children always taught to assert that "CHRIST is GOD" as "but half the truth"?

Your Lordship further affirmed: "from eternity Christ is God, but for 1900 years He is likewise Man." I inquired whether you therefore wished me to understand that the Church officially teaches that CHRIST is *never* GOD only; but is *always* GOD and MAN?

The receipt of this information will greatly oblige me.

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XLVI.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Mch 5th 09.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

I am unable to understand why my letters of Feby 3rd, 18th and 25th remain unanswered.

Earnestly do I trust that I may soon receive the information sought.

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

XLVII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Mch 16th 09.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

I beg your Lordship will no longer be pleased, apparently without reason, to disregard my repeated appeals for light upon the religious statements of your representatives, which, I regret, were not made clear to me in your letter of Jany 22nd.

It is quite conceivable that it may not be convenient for you to give the matter your personal

attention; in that event I should be grateful if you would kindly say from whom such official knowledge may be obtained.

I am, my lord,
Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

XLVIII.

London House,
32, S. James's Square, S.W.
Mch. 17.

Dear Sir

The Clergy of your Parish are the officials provided by the Church and sent by the Bishop to give you such instruction as you desire in the Christian faith.

I am ys v truly
M. P. GILLSON,
Chaplain.

XLIX.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.
Mch 31st 09.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir:

My thanks are due you for having so kindly received me when I called upon you in accordance

with the Bishop of London's advice of the 17th inst.

Your replies to the specific inquiries addressed to his lordship and laid before you, were, I understand, as follows:

- 1.—The Church everywhere and at all times teaches or intends to teach that the statement "CHRIST is GOD" is "but half the truth"; and little children are, or at least should always be taught to affirm "CHRIST is GOD" as "but half the truth."
- 2.—The name JESUS CHRIST (as you have already written me) is not properly given or applied to the Son *not-Incarnate*, i.e. before Incarnation; the Church, however, "loosely, and with no authority whatsoever other than usage" (I think these were your exact words) gives and applies the name JESUS CHRIST to the SON *not-Incarnate* and teaches:

"JESUS CHRIST is GOD only."

"JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself."

"JESUS CHRIST is the Omnipotent Creator of the World."

"God died on the Cross."

And did I understand you to say also:

JESUS CHRIST is "the One living, true God, Everlasting and without body, parts or passions: of infinite power, wisdom and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things visible and invisible"?

I should be greatly obliged if you would give me or help me in getting as comprehensive and

complete a list as possible of the various senses or meanings in which you stated the term "GOD" and the name "JESUS CHRIST" are used, without qualification, by the Church.

I am,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

L.

156, Albany Street, N.W.

Apl 6th 1909

Dear Sir,

I have received your letter of 31st ult. To the words quoted under (1) I adhere. I adhere also to the statement in (2) that the name Jesus Xt. is not properly given or applied to the Son not-incarnate; but that Christians, loosely, and with no formal authority other than usage, do give and apply the name Jesus Xt. to the Son not-incarnate.

I have substituted "Christians" for "the Church," because the latter words give the impression of a corporate body making a dogmatic definition, whereas my point is that the phrases you quote are those of popular religion; not of technical theology.

None of the phrases you quote should be affirmed apart from the context in which they occur. With that reservation I allow that you may find in the language of religion and worship the words "Jesus Christ is God Himself" or "God died on the Cross" or "Jesus Christ is the Omnipotent Creator

of the World." I don't think you would ever find the words "Jesus Christ is God only" either in the language of devotion or of theology, for they might be taken as a denial of His human nature.

Certainly the statement "Jesus Xt. is the One living and true God etc." wd. not be used, since the latter part of the statement is a highly technical description, and we should therefore expect the whole of the statement to be precise and technical.

As to the usage of the term "God" and the name "Jesus Christ" I do not think I can refer to any authority, but the following uses occur to me.

Christians use the term "God" in the sense common to all Theistic religions simply to denote the Supreme Being. Again in a more definitely Christian sense "God" may denote the Supreme Being conceived as Trinity in Unity, or any Person considered singly. The term may be applied to the Second Person either before or after His incarnation.

The name Jesus Christ is given to the Son of God in His earthly life, and in His present exalted life, and less exactly, by a kind of reflection, to Him in His pre-incarnate state. These applications seem to me to cover the ground.

Of course these explanations which I have given are on my own authority only; but I trust they represent the teaching of the Church.

And may I repeat that the essence of our religion lies not in any doctrinal statement but in the attitude of our mind towards Jesus Christ: we worship Him, pray to Him, accept His teaching

as revealing the Divine Will, and try to serve Him, trusting to His power.

That is to say we give Him a faith, honour, worship, and service which we could not rightly give if we believed Him to be less than God. Doctrinal statements are after all but instruments, and those imperfect, by which we endeavour to safeguard and transmit the faith.

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD PACE.

LI.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Apl 9th 09.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir :

Will you pardon my again troubling you, but I am not sure I quite rightly grasp the meaning of your answer to my letter of Mch 31st.

Am I to understand that, under no circumstances, does "*the Church*" ever give or apply the name JESUS CHRIST to the Son *not-incarnate*? but that she invariably holds and teaches :

"JESUS CHRIST is *never* GOD only"

"JESUS CHRIST is *not* GOD Himself "

"JESUS CHRIST is *not* the Omnipotent Creator of the World"

"GOD did *not* die on the Cross"

—that it is only in the inaccurate language of

“popular religion,”—which “*the Church*” in no way upholds, sanctions or teaches,—that “*Christians*, loosely, and with no formal authority other than usage, do give and apply the name Jesus Xt. to the Son not Incarnate” and erroneously declare the reverse of the above accurate doctrinal statements of “*the Church*”?

I am,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

LII.

156, Albany Street, N.W.

April 13. 09

Dear Sir,

I am not sure that I follow the course of our discussion, which seems about words only.

Let me say that the Church is a religious society for the worship of God and the service of Man, and not a legal body occupied in the definition of words.

As I said before, the name “Jesus” was the name given at the circumcision of the Child on the 8th day, the title “Christ” was given later but before the close of his life. Before the close of the period in which the New Testament was written “Jesus Christ” had become a name for *the Person* whom we believe to have been with the Father before Creation, to have become incarnate some 1900 years

ago, and to be now exalted at the right hand of the Father.

Now the Church is concerned with *the Person* and not with the name, and to the best of my knowledge there has never been a formal discussion and decision on the question of the application of *the name*.

Church Councils have always been held to decide points of actual controversy. Incidentally you will find the name "Jesus Christ" used to cover *the whole existence* of the Second Person of the Trinity. I can refer to the decree of the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) which is universally recognised. I translate parts relevant. "We teach that we should acknowledge our Lord *Jesus Christ* to be perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood . . . according to his Godhead *begotten of the Father before the worlds*, and in the last days (i.e. in the Christian era) born of the Virgin Mary according to his manhood." There you have the *name* Jesus Christ referring to the Son not yet incarnate and to his incarnate state in one and the same sentence.

The phrase "*God was crucified*" was first used in public worship just before 470 A.D. It was pronounced orthodox by the Emperor Justinian in 533, acting in accordance with the Pope John II., Bishop of Rome, but in opposition to his predecessor. There is therefore some authority for that phrase.

My answer to your question is therefore No. The Church does not invariably hold and teach:

Jesus Christ is never God only etc. Nor do

Christians declare *erroneously* in popular religion the reverse of those statements.

If you will recognise that Christians are talking about a Person and not a *name*, I think the difficulty will disappear.

Yours faithfully

EDWARD PACE.

LIII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Apl 17th 09.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir :

It is not my wish to discuss words, or indeed religious matters, but merely to receive specific instruction regarding the Church's doctrines.

In your letter of July 27th last, you yourself informed me : "The name Jesus Christ is not properly applicable to the Son until incarnation." To this you added : "Sometimes of course, when we are not speaking in technical theological language, we use the word Christ to designate the Second Person of the Trinity, but strictly, it should be applied only to Him as incarnate."

Am I now to understand from your letter of Apl 13th that the Anglican Church, neither "strictly" nor "properly," but inaccurately and contrary to the application in the New Testament,

does give the name JESUS CHRIST to the Son *not*-incarnate and denies that:

"JESUS CHRIST is *not* the Omnipotent Creator of the World."

"GOD did *not* die on the Cross"

on the authority of the "universally recognised" decree of the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) and the Pronouncement of the Emperor Justinian in 533 that the phrase "God was crucified" is orthodox?

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

LIV.

156, Albany St., N.W.

Apl 19th 1909.

Dear Sir,

May I try to clear our discussion by an illustration? Take the statement "Queen Victoria was born on May 24th 1819." That would, I think, be counted as true. But strictly speaking the child born on May 24th 1819 was not yet called Victoria and did not become queen for 18 years. I imagine however that no one would cavil at the statement: "Queen Victoria was born on May 24th 1819." We understand that we are speaking of the person who later was called Victoria and Queen and whose usual name is Queen Victoria.

The use of the name Jesus Christ is similar to this, and the use is as legitimate in one case as in the other. "Strictly," "accurately," "properly" the name Queen Victoria did not yet belong to the

baby born on May 24th 1819, but who would see difficulties in applying the well-known common name from the first?

There is nothing more mysterious in the application of the name Jesus Christ to the Son at any stage of His existence.

I quoted the decree of the Council of Chalcedon as an instance of such use, but no other authority is needed for so simple a proceeding than the ordinary use of names, and it is not fair to found arguments or see affirmations and denials in the application of the name Jesus Christ to the Son not incarnate.

Yours faithfully

EDWARD PACE.

LV.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

May 5th 09.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir :

Your illustration of Queen Victoria, I fear, impresses me only as emphasising your previous assurances that the name JESUS CHRIST cannot be given, with accuracy, truth, or in accordance with New Testament usage, to the Son *not*-incarnate.

The statement "Queen Victoria *was* born on May 24th 1819" is undoubtedly, and beyond "cavil" perfectly true. But, I think you will

agree, the statement "Queen Victoria *is* born on May 24th 1819" could, in no sense, be counted either accurate or true because it would imply she was Queen Victoria *when* she was born.

In the same way your analogy points that whereas the statement "JESUS CHRIST *was* the SON *not-incarnate*" is perfectly true; the statement "JESUS CHRIST *is* the SON *not-incarnate*" can, in no sense, be counted either accurate or true because it implies that the SON was JESUS CHRIST *before incarnation*, which, I believe you informed me, is not the case.

It is, consequently, most difficult for me to understand your intimation that this "illustration" makes an inaccurate, untrue, unbiblical use of the name JESUS CHRIST a "simple," "ordinary," "legitimate," "fair" proceeding, and precludes the need of the "universally recognised" authorities you quoted in support of the affirmations "JESUS CHRIST is the Creator of the World" and "GOD died on the Cross."

Nor, I regret to say, does your illustration appear less mysterious when you further suggest that even as *the baby born on May 24th 1819* is "the person who later was called Victoria and Queen and whose usual name is Queen Victoria" so "*God, the Creator of the World*, is "the person who later was called" JESUS and CHRIST "and whose usual name is" JESUS CHRIST.

Here, again, it seems, you find it necessary to give the title Queen Victoria to the baby born on

May 24th 1819 in order to give the title JESUS CHRIST to GOD.

Am I to take it, as your letter indicates, that this strangely manipulated simile, is the *sole* justification and authority upon which the Church, "the decree of the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.)," and the pronouncement of "the Emperor Justinian in 533,"—in opposition to the New Testament,—apply the name JESUS CHRIST to GOD, the Creator of the World?

I am,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

LVI.

Hatfield Hall,

Durham.

May 14th 09.

Dear Sir,

Your letter has been forwarded to me from London.

Your criticism of my last illustration suggests several reflections, but I refrain from replying because I see no probability of our ever reaching a conclusion, nor do I feel that I am helping you to attain your purpose.

Believe me,

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD PACE.

LVII.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

May 22nd 09.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir:

Let me give you every assurance that you are helping me greatly. Probably in your "several reflections" lies the very light by which a conclusion will at once be reached; so I entreat you not to refrain from replying to my inquiry of May 5th.

I am,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

LVIII.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

June 3rd 09.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir:

I beg to draw your attention to my letter of May 22nd.

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER

LIX.

The Studio,
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

June 9th 09.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir:

Why do you still withhold from me the particular religious information asked of you on May 5th, May 22nd, and again on June 3rd?

On March 17th Mr. Gillson wrote: "The clergy of your parish are the officials provided by the Church and sent by the Bishop to give you such instruction as you desire in the Christian faith."

I hope I have not applied to you in vain.

I am,

Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

LX.

Hatfield Hall,
Durham

June 9th 09.

Dear Sir,

I apologise for not having answered your last letter, but in spite of its courteous request, I must keep to my original decision not to continue this correspondence as I am too busy to give longer time to it.

With kind regards,

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD PACE.

Lawrence Sterner Esq.

LXI.

Hatfield Hall,

Durham

June 11th 09.

Dear Sir,

Your letter of the 9th has been forwarded to me, and by this time you will have received my last letter, which is practically an answer to it.

I trust you will not find the refusal contained in it discourteous. What you say, or quote, as to the duty of the parochial clergy to give religious instruction is true; but it applies to the case of those who are in religious doubt or difficulty. That is not your case, as your interest is a purely scientific one, and your claim on me is merely that of one student upon another. I have tried to meet that claim to what I feel is an adequate extent, and as I see no probable end of our correspondence I have ventured to make one.

Further I am not engaged in parochial work at present, but in University work which is fully taxing my energy. So I must again ask you kindly to excuse me. As a matter of fact you would find yourself quite able to follow out your quest in a history of Christian doctrine which you could get from any good library. Hagenbach's "History of Doctrine," or Ottley's "Doctrine of the Incarnation" would suit your purpose.

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD PACE.

LXII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A. July 5th 09.
Sir:

I hope you will pardon my having so long delayed acknowledging your kindly conclusory favour of the 11th ult., as also my feeling an obligation to point out certain misapprehensions under which it was evidently written.

When you first approached me, in July last, concerning my correspondence with the Bishop of London, I thought I explained, in response to your inquiry, that my interest in religious matters is of a purely *educational* nature; it is therefore "scientific" only as it relates to *the Science of Education*, in which, to my mind, Religion cannot but play a very important part.

May I also beg to remind you that I was referred back to you by the Bishop, in March, to elucidate his letter of January 22nd. You will remember his Lordship affirmed: "*The statement Christ is God is of course incomplete because it is but half the truth*" and intimated that, for this reason, *the Church teaches JESUS CHRIST is never GOD only, but is always GOD and MAN.*

With regard to the Bishop's *affirmation*, you, on Apl 6th, defined the teachings of the Church for me most distinctly and clearly as follows:

"The Church, everywhere and at all times teaches or intends to teach that the statement 'CHRIST is GOD' is 'but half the truth,' and

little children are, or at least should always be taught to affirm 'CHRIST is GOD' as 'but half the truth.'"

On the question of his Lordship's *intimation*, your statements, as you are aware, have caused me to mistrust my understanding. These taken from your letters,—particularly those of Apl 6th, 13th and 19th,—seem to be:

- 1.—The name Jesus Christ is not properly given or applied to the SON not-incarnate and is nowhere so given or applied in the Bible, New Testament or Creeds in use in the Church.
- 2.—The Church, however, does so improperly, unscripturally, "loosely" give and apply the name of JESUS CHRIST to the SON not-incarnate, and "*does not invariably hold and teach JESUS CHRIST is never GOD only,*" but holds teaches and correctly declares: "JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself; "JESUS CHRIST is the Omnipotent Creator of the World," and also "GOD died on the Cross."
- 3.—The Church puts forth the claim (which, as I had occasion to observe, in my letter of May 5th, impressed me as being a strange one) that "no other authority is needed" to justify such *improper, loose, unscriptural* application of the human name and title JESUS CHRIST, to GOD, the Creator of the World, than the "illustration" of applying the name and title Queen Victoria to the baby born on May 24th 1819 and the deduction that because "*Queen Victoria was born*" is true, therefore "*JESUS CHRIST is GOD*" is true.

If this represents your authoritative doctrinal exposition of the Bishop of London's communication "the end of our correspondence" has been duly reached; if not, and you will, at your convenience, revise it finally to your own satisfaction, I shall be grateful.

I am,

Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

LXIII.

The Studio,
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

Aug 7th 09.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir:

When may I hope to hear from you with reference to my letter of July 5th?

Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

LXIV.

The Studio,
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

Aug 23rd 09.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir:

I am still awaiting to learn when it will be convenient for you to give my letter of July 5th your attention.

Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

LXV.

156, Albany St. N.W.

Aug. 30. 09

Dear Sir,

Your last two letters to me have not received attention because I have been travelling and did not return to London till Saturday last.

I did not reply to your letter of July 5th because it seemed impossible to do so without reopening the whole discussion, which, as it seems to me, has not been about religion but really about the use of words. Language being what it is, it is not difficult to point out seeming inconsistency in the use of names and titles by Christians, but I feel sure that what I have already said is enough to show you that we mean what the Bishop says, viz. "The statement Christ is God is incomplete because it is but half the truth." My letters have been simply an attempt to make that statement clearer to you. Your replies have skilfully raised a number of logical and terminological difficulties into which I feel it is unnecessary and unprofitable to go further. I cannot do more in the way of explanation, nor can I give my assent to propositions which though they consist partly of quotations from my own letters are so constructed as to give a different colouring to my words.

Neither the Bishop's meaning, nor my own is far to seek, if you will do so candidly and not attempt to refine upon our words in such a way as to give them a sense which we do not intend them to bear.

I thank you for the courtesy with which you have written, but I do not intend to answer any more letters.

I am,

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD PACE.

LXVI.

(Registered Letter.)

The Studio,

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Sept 21st 09.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir:

You must have known, when you brought *general* charges against me of "partly" quoting, constructing and refining upon the Bishop's and your own words so as to give them "a different colouring" or "a sense" which you "do not intend them to bear," that it was incumbent upon you to support your charges with at least one *specific* case. That you have failed to revise or even point out a single instance of such misrepresentation in my letter of July 5th, or, indeed, in any of my letters, is significant.

These ambiguous, unsupported and, I submit, groundless accusations, are, obviously, but the culmination of the exhaustive series of excuses to which you have subjected me since May 5th in order to evade my simple inquiry of that date with regard

to your strange "illustration" of Queen Victoria. Let me roughly enumerate these excuses:—May 14th, my "criticism" of your "last illustration suggests several reflections but" you "refrain from replying" fearing no "conclusion"; my entreaty "not to 'refrain from replying' to my inquiry of May 5th"—ignored; June 9th,—to another appeal,—you are "too busy"; still another evokes, on June 11th, my "interest is a purely scientific one" and I have, in consequence, no claim to your *official* information; when, on July 5th, I established my claim and defined a conclusion,—there follows a long silence; two reminders are finally required to elicit, on Aug 30th, that it was impossible for you to reply "without reopening the whole discussion";—my "replies have skilfully raised a number of logical and terminological difficulties into which . . . it is unnecessary and unprofitable to go further"; you "cannot do more in the way of explanation,"—but, seeming to have deemed excuses as insufficient, you make unwarrantable *general* charges and stifle defence with "I do not intend to answer any more letters." It seems incredible that these pleas should have been devised to avoid answering my very simple question of May 5th as to *whether the "illustration" of Queen Victoria was advanced by you on Apl. 19th as the authoritative justification for that which you had previously written to me, namely: that the name JESUS CHRIST is improperly, loosely, unscripturally applied to the Son not-Incarnate, or was this illustration merely an idea originating with yourself and having no official value?* And

yet, that is the only information I have desired and repeatedly asked of you since May 5th; the only information for which I now once more ask.

Sir, it is not my wish to refer this particular inquiry concerning your "illustration" of Queen Victoria to the Bishop of London. I am therefore registering this letter so that, in default of your early reply, I may be assured it has reached your hands.

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

LXVII.

156 Albany St. N.W.

Dear Sir,

Sept. 22nd 09

I am going to be inconsistent and reply to your letter of yesterday as it contains a question I can answer in a few words.

My "illustration" was my own invention and has no official value. It occurred to me as a useful parallel. I am sorry it failed to help you.

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD PACE.

LXVIII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Oct 29th 09.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir:

My reason for having at first applied to *the Bishop of London* to learn whether or not the Church of England held and taught that CHRIST is

GOD, was (as I wrote to his chaplain on Sept 29th of last year) that I might thereby "rely upon the accuracy and authority of the information received"; and it was in this very connection that you were sent to me and I was subsequently referred back to you by your Bishop. Considering these circumstances, it seems extraordinary that,—in pursuance of an evident wish to justify the statements "JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself"; "JESUS CHRIST is the Omnipotent Creator of the World,"—you should, on Apl 13th, have cited "the decree of the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) which is universally recognised," and then, on Apl 19th, have repudiated the need of this authority by thrusting forward the "illustration" of Queen Victoria as *affording all the authority and justification that is necessary*,—only to at last inform me that this "illustration" (which I noted, on May 5th, did not show, as you claimed, "nothing more mysterious" than the "simple proceeding" of "the ordinary use of names"; but, on the contrary, was a "strangely manipulated simile" in which you compared the *passing event* of a child being born on May 24th 1819, to the *permanent existence* of GOD, the Creator of the World, and, from this premise, deduced that because "Queen Victoria was born" is true, therefore "JESUS CHRIST is GOD" is true,)—that this "illustration" was of your "own invention," occurring to you as "a useful parallel," and having "no official value."

What may you have meant by thus endeavouring to support Church teachings with a "decree" which you afterwards implied was *authoritatively*

unnecessary; and to justify them with an "illustration" which you now state to be *officially valueless*? and in what manner did you expect that this would help me?

You have so often emphasised for me the fact that the human name and title JESUS CHRIST strictly, accurately, properly designates the SON *incarnate* (i.e. in the flesh) and that *nowhere in Holy Scripture is the human name and title JESUS CHRIST given to the SON not-incarnate (i.e. not in the flesh) such application being improper, loose and incorrect*,—that your official withdrawal of the "illustration" of Queen Victoria makes it appear that *the Church*, while confessing it is *improper, loose, incorrect and unscriptural* to give or apply the name JESUS CHRIST to the SON *not-incarnate*, yet holds and teaches that it is *correct* to declare "JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself"; "JESUS CHRIST is the Creator of the World," with *neither authority nor justification*. Is that what I am now to understand?

Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

LXIX.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A. Nov 12th 09.

Sir:

May I hope to shortly receive your answer to my letter of Oct 29?

Yours obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

LXX.

Hatfield Hall,
Durham.
15 Nov, 1909

Dear Sir,

I am sorry that I can give no other reply to your letters than that I regret I cannot continue this correspondence.

Yours faithfully,
EDWARD PACE.

LXXI.

"The Studio,"
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.
Dec 21st 1909

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir:

Your letter of Nov 15th duly reached me. As you write, finally, that you "cannot continue" your instruction, I cannot expect you to do so. But I venture to hope that you will not refuse to define for me a past statement of yours, the ambiguity of which, I regret to say, has quite escaped my notice until the present moment.

On Apl 13th you informed me:

"The Church does not invariably hold and teach:

JESUS CHRIST is *never* GOD only, etc., nor do Christians declare *erroneously*, in popular religion, the reverse of the statements."

Now, I think, the *reverse* of the above phrase would be:

Christians do not declare *erroneously*, in popular religion,

JESUS CHRIST is *always* GOD only.

Is that exactly what you intended to state?

I am compelled to ask this question because the first part of your statement leaves the possible inference that:

The Church invariably holds and teaches:

JESUS CHRIST is *sometimes* GOD only.

Your early reply would be esteemed a great favour.

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

LXXII.

(Registered Letter.)

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Jan'y 14th 1910

To the Rev. Edward Pace, M.A.

Sir,

It may be that, in the press of 'Xmas postal business, a letter which I sent you on Dec 21st has miscarried. I now enclose a copy of it, which I register to make sure it reaches you.

You will see that you have put "the Church" in extraordinary conflict with herself by indicating

that she invariably *holds and teaches* JESUS CHRIST is *sometimes* GOD only, and *sanctions* the declaration of "Christians," in "popular religion" that JESUS CHRIST is *always* GOD only.

I want to know *definitely* which you intended me to understand is the truth. Should I not hear from you within a few days I shall assume that you, personally, cannot reconcile this doctrinal discrepancy in your statement of Apl 13th.

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

LXXIII.

(Registered Letter.)

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Feby 1st, 1910.

To the Rt. Rev.

the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

The Rev. Edward Pace has now finally informed me that he "cannot continue" to officially elucidate your communication of Jany 22nd of last year, for which I was referred back to him on Mch 17th. You may recall that I particularly wished to learn, and repeatedly asked, if I was to understand, as your Lordship apparently intimated, that *the*

Church officially teaches CHRIST is never GOD only; but is always GOD and MAN.

I called on Mr. Pace, and he assured me that that was not your meaning,—indeed, that quite the contrary was the truth. He wrote on Apl 13th :

“The Church does not invariably hold and teach: JESUS CHRIST is *never* GOD Himself; JESUS CHRIST is *not* the Omnipotent Creator of the World; GOD did *not* die on the Cross. Nor do Christians declare *erroneously*, in popular religion, the reverse of those statements,” i.e. JESUS CHRIST is *always* GOD only; JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself; JESUS CHRIST is the Omnipotent Creator of the world; GOD *did* die on the Cross.

But when Mr. Pace was, in the first place, sent to me, he persistently stated (July 6th, July 27th and Aug 5th 1908) that it is “not correct” to apply the *name* or *title* CHRIST to the SON *not-incarnate*; that it is not “properly” or “strictly” so applicable, and is *nowhere so given or applied in the Bible*. He reaffirmed this fact, on Apl 6th, in the following remarkable words:

“I adhere also to the statement in (2) that the name Jesus Xt. is not properly given or applied to the Son not-incarnate, but that Christians, loosely, and with no formal authority other than usage, do give and apply the name Jesus Xt. to the Son not-incarnate.”

Mr. Pace moreover explained (Apl 13th) that this *avowedly improper, loose, incorrect, unscriptural*

application of the name JESUS CHRIST by "Christians," had begun "before the close of the period in which the New Testament was written"; that the Church is not "concerned" with *the name* JESUS CHRIST, and that, to the best of his knowledge, "there has never been a formal discussion and decision on the question of the application of *the name*."

It seems, therefore, Mr. Pace has most strangely resolved those statements in your Lordship's letter of Jan'y 22nd 1909 which were obscure to me, thus:

"With no formal authority other than usage" (i.e. some 1600 years of *improper, loose, incorrect, unscriptural* application of the name JESUS CHRIST to the SON *not-incarnate*, by "Christians,") the Church, *not concerned with the name* JESUS CHRIST, and *heedless of the fact that it is applied in disaccordance with propriety, strictness, correctness and the Bible*, holds and teaches that the statements JESUS CHRIST is always GOD only; JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself; JESUS CHRIST is the Omnipotent Creator of the World, (as declared by "Christians" in "popular religion") are the truth.

Mr. Pace's final suggestion (Nov 15th) that some *inability* prevents him from *continuing* would lead one to suppose that he has left his elucidation uncompleted. Should he have done so, will you kindly apprise me, or have me apprised of that which yet remains to be *officially* added on the question of the application of the name JESUS CHRIST to the SON *not-incarnate*.

Copies of Mr. Pace's letters are at your disposal should you desire them.

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

P.S.—Mr. Pace stated (Apl 13th) that there is "some authority" for the phrase "GOD died on the Cross" in that "it was pronounced orthodox by the Emperor Justinian in 533 acting in accordance with the Pope John II, Bishop of Rome."

LXXIV.

(Registered Letter.)

The Studio,
61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

Feby 21st 1910.

To the Rt. Rev.
the Lord Bishop of London.

My Lord Bishop:

Am I to understand that you find nothing remains to be added to Mr. Pace's official statements, quoted in my letter of the 1st inst.?

Permit me to direct your Lordship's particular attention to his peculiar negative utterance of Apl 13th, wherein he clearly advocates that

"Christians" *rightly* declare "in popular religion": JESUS CHRIST is *always* GOD only: JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself: JESUS CHRIST is the Omnipotent Creator of the World; yet casts the first of those declarations into strange doubt by, at the same time, implying that "the Church" invariably holds and teaches: JESUS CHRIST is *sometimes* GOD only. I, recently (Dec 21st), pointed out this fact to Mr. Pace, and afterwards inquired (Jany 14th) whether he intended me to understand the Church teaches "*always*" or "*sometimes*" to be the truth; but, to this, it seems, he could give no answer. Your Lordship, of course, can labour under no such difficulty and doubt. I therefore trust you will grant me this specific information.

Should I not hear from you in a few days' time, I cannot but reluctantly conclude that you not only find there remains nothing to be added to the official statements which I have quoted, but that your Lordship does share Mr. Pace's apparent difficulty and doubt as to which the Church officially and authoritatively holds to be the truth: JESUS CHRIST is *always* GOD only, or JESUS CHRIST is *sometimes* GOD only. In this event I must appeal to other authority.

I am, my lord,

Yours obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

P.S.—I am registering this letter, as I did the last one, that I may be certain it reaches you.

LXXV.

(Registered Letter.)

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

Mch 10th 1910

To His Grace

the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury,
Lambeth Palace, S.E.

My Lord Archbishop:

On May 28th 1908, I had occasion to address a simple inquiry to the Bishop of London about the doctrine that CHRIST is GOD. The reply was not to the point; therefore I had to write again emphasising my question. The second answer contained references which could not be verified, because, as was later stated (July 6th 1908) "the Bishop's letter was not strictly accurate as regards *the exact words* 'CHRIST is GOD.'" And to all my subsequent requests for the definite and specific teachings of the Church, the information, often tardily accorded me by the Bishop himself, his Chaplain (Mr. Gillson) and his local representative (the Rev. Edward Pace) has seemed so extraordinarily unsatisfactory that I am constrained to bring it to your Grace's notice, especially the following statements:

On June 5th 1908, Mr. Gillson wrote:

"—— the Church has everywhere and at all times taught the foundation truth of our faith that CHRIST is GOD. You will find it stated in

all the three Creeds, particularly in that of S. Athanasius."

On July 27th 1908, Mr. Pace wrote :

"The name Jesus Christ is not properly applicable to the Son until the Incarnation and that explains why you will not find in the Creeds the unqualified statement that CHRIST is God."

On Jan'y 22nd 1909, the Bishop of London wrote :

"The statement that 'Christ is God' is, of course incomplete because it is but half the truth."

On Apl 6th 1909, Mr. Pace, on behalf of the Bishop, wrote, confirming his own verbal statement :

"The Church everywhere and at all times teaches, or intends to teach that the statement 'CHRIST is GOD' is 'but half the truth'; and little children are, or at least should always be taught to affirm 'CHRIST is GOD' as 'but half the truth.'"

From Apl 6th to Nov. 15th 1909, Mr. Pace's statements, explaining the Bishop's further meaning (I enclose, herewith, copies of my last two letters to his Lordship, still unanswered, in which may be found the full quotations and references) appear to be, substantially, and almost incredibly, I think :

The Church is not "concerned" with *the name* JESUS CHRIST, and, with no "formal authority"

or even "discussion," she now continues to uphold and advocate the early Christian usage of *improperly, loosely, incorrectly, unscripturally* giving and applying the name JESUS CHRIST to the SON *not-incarnate*, and declaring, as the truth: JESUS CHRIST is *always* GOD only: JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself: JESUS CHRIST is the Omnipotent Creator of the World.

But then, as your Grace may observe, although Mr. Pace stated, with certainty: "The Church does not invariably hold and teach JESUS CHRIST is *never* GOD only," yet both he and the Bishop are seemingly in difficulty and doubt as to which the Church holds to be the truth: JESUS CHRIST is *always* GOD only, or, JESUS CHRIST is *sometimes* GOD only.

It is incomprehensible that such difficulty and doubt should appear to exist in the Church of England, and that, she should hold and teach, or advocate that which the Bishop of London and his clergy so deliberately state to be *improper, loose, incorrect, unscriptural* and *half the truth*.

My need is to receive some satisfactory explanation of these things, and I confidently await it, at your Grace's pleasure.

Should you wish copies of other letters, they shall be sent you.

I am, your Grace,

Obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

LXXVI.

Lambeth Palace. S.E.

14th March 1910.

Dear Sir,

I have read your letter of March 10th. I am afraid that with the immense daily work which is on my hands it is impossible for me to enter with you into a correspondence upon the theological point you have raised. You have already heard from others, and I suggest that you should read such books as the Bampton Lectures of Dr. Liddon and Bishop Gore, both of whom deal with the kind of question about which you write.

I am

Yours very truly,

RANDALL CANTUAR.

Lawrence Sterner, Esq.

LXXVII.

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

Mch 31st 1910.

To

His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

My Lord Archbishop:

Thank you for your gracious communication of the 14th inst. A book of Bishop Gore, also the Bampton Lectures of Dr. Liddon were recommended to me by the Bishop of London's Chaplain

and Mr. Pace, respectively, in letters of June 10th and July 6th 1908, Mr. Pace adding that Liddon's work "probably," and "certainly" the book of Bishop Gore, would be of more use for a "controversial" than for *my own* "purpose." The Lectures of Dr. Liddon had been sent to me to read some six months before those dates, and it was "the theological point" therein "raised" (until I read the ¹ I was in total ignorance that the Church of England was involved in that "kind of question") which, ultimately, determined me to eschew *controversy* and seek the specific and authoritative *teaching* of the Church,—which teaching, obviously, is not officially stated in "such books as the Bampton Lectures of Dr. Liddon and Bishop Gore" which you suggested I should read.

Grave anxiety, which was the outcome of my reading the Bampton Lectures, and which was increased by the *official* teachings I have "heard from others" and laid before you, has placed me under the compulsion of humbly approaching your Grace, as head of the Church, for definite assurances respecting those teachings. Having particularly in mind the declarations of the Bishop of London and his clergy that "the statement that 'CHRIST is GOD' is, of course, incomplete because it is but half the truth" and that "—— little children are, or at least should always be taught to affirm 'CHRIST is GOD' as 'but half the truth,'" and with the profoundest regard for the value of your Grace's time, I frame my inquiries simply:

1.—Does the Church of England teach that

JESUS CHRIST is the Supreme Creator of the Universe, without any qualification; or, that JESUS CHRIST is *not* the Supreme Creator of the Universe, without any qualification?

- 2.—Does the Church of England teach that JESUS CHRIST had human person; or, that JESUS CHRIST had *not* human person?
- 3.—Are little children always warned by the Church of England that to give and apply the name JESUS CHRIST to the *not*-incarnate SON is, as avowed, *improper, loose, incorrect and unscriptural*; or, are they *not* always so warned?

Your Grace's specific answers to these three inquiries, whether personal or by proxy, could, I venture to think, be given in a very brief and concise manner, and would leave the official and authoritative teaching of the Church of England, on this most solemn "theological point" in no uncertain Light.

I am, your Grace,
Obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

LXXVIII.

Private.

Lambeth Palace. S.E.

2nd April 1910.

Dear Sir,

In reply to your letter of March 31st, the Archbishop of Canterbury directs me to repeat that he

fears it is impossible for him to enter with you into a correspondence upon the deep and mysterious theological questions which you have raised. The Church of England allows to her children a wide variety of opinion in regard to the due interpretation of the teachings of Holy Scripture upon great questions, and neither the Archbishop of Canterbury nor anyone else can, of his own authority, give final dicta with reference to these deep mysteries in such a way as you desire.

God the Holy Spirit will guide you in the right interpretation of the Christian Creed in answer to your earnest prayer.

Yours faithfully

E. L. A. HERTSLET.

(Chaplain.).

Lawrence Sterner, Esq.

LXXIX.

(Registered Letter.)

"The Studio,"

61 Albany Street,

Regent's Park, N.W.

May 25th 1910.

To His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

My Lord Archbishop:

Your letter of Apl 2nd, to which I could not sooner devote the requisite attention, is much esteemed. It appears to effectually dispose of the

first two of my inquiries, which, on March 30th, I found myself compelled to address to your Grace. You say you cannot, as head of the Church, specifically answer those "deep and mysterious theological questions,"—that the Church of England leaves to "her children" to determine which is "the due interpretation of the teachings of Holy Scripture," which "the right interpretation of the Christian Creed": "JESUS CHRIST is the Supreme Creator of the Universe, without any qualification," or "JESUS CHRIST is *not* the Supreme Creator of the Universe, without any qualification"; "JESUS CHRIST had human person"; or "JESUS CHRIST had *not* human person." Though Mr. Pace informed me (Apl 13th 1909) that "Church Councils have always been held to decide points of actual controversy"; yet, as I understand from your letter, no Church Council has ever decided these "great questions," and "neither the Archbishop of Canterbury nor anyone else can, of his own authority, give final dicta, with reference to these deep mysteries."

That communication your Grace marked "Private." There was but one other answer to my inquiries for the specific and authoritative *teaching* of the Church which was so marked, namely, that of Bishop of London's Chaplain, dated June 5th 1908. "I have marked this letter private," he wrote, "simply meaning that I do not wish it published." In that "private" letter, alone, such "final dicta" as your Grace rejected as having no authority, was authoritatively given. I have already informed you of that *final dictum* of Mr. Gillson that "the Church has everywhere and at

all times taught the foundation truth of our faith that CHRIST is GOD"; also that Mr. Pace stated (July 6th 1908) it "was not strictly accurate as regards *the exact words* 'CHRIST is GOD'"; that (July 27th 1908) "the name JESUS CHRIST is not properly applicable to the SON until the Incarnation and that explains why you will not find in the Creeds the unqualified statement that CHRIST is God"; and that the Bishop of London affirmed (Jany 22nd 1909) that this *final dictum* concerning "the foundation truth" of the Church is "but half the truth."

That your Grace has now definitely assured me, in answer to my inquiries numbered 1 and 2, that such "final dicta" are taught in excess of authority, causes me the utmost uneasiness about my inquiry No. 3, to which you have made no reference. That inquiry dealt, in no way, with "deep mysteries," matters of "opinion" or "interpretation," but with the *facts* of Mr. Pace's information from Apl 6th to Nov 15th 1909, which appear to shew *how* officials of the Church of England teach, as the truth, the "final dicta," authority for which your Grace, as head of the Church, has repudiated. It is probable, as my inquiry No. 3 has elicited no reply from you, that those facts were not sufficiently set forth in my brief summary of Mch. 10th. I am extremely sorry, therefore, to have now to bring them more fully to your Grace's knowledge.

Mr. Pace led me to understand that the officials of the Church of England, when dealing with these

"great questions," employ two distinct languages, namely, those of "technical theology" and "popular religion." When speaking in the former, the name JESUS CHRIST is used *properly, strictly, correctly, and in accordance with Holy Scripture*, and is, therefore, never given and applied to the SON *not-incarnate* (apparently no less than *the Supreme Creator of the Universe without any qualification and with no human person*); when speaking in the latter, the name JESUS CHRIST is used *improperly, loosely, incorrectly, unscripturally* and is given and applied to the SON *not-incarnate*. Mr. Pace also made a distinction between "the Church" and "Christians." Your Grace will best gather the purpose of these distinctions from Mr. Pace's own explanation. Elucidating, for the Bishop of London, his Lordship's apparent intimation that *the Church invariably holds and teaches CHRIST is never GOD only, but is always GOD and MAN*, he wrote (Apl 6th 1909): "I have substituted 'Christians' for 'the Church,' because the latter words give the impression of a corporate body making a dogmatic definition, whereas my point is that the phrases you quote ("JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself"; "JESUS CHRIST is the Omnipotent Creator of the World"; "GOD died on the Cross," phrases used by Mr. Pace during a personal interview) are those of popular religion; not technical theology." As your Grace has already read (in the copy I sent you of my letter of Feby 1st to the Bishop of London) Mr. Pace afterwards cited the Pronouncement of "the Emperor Justinian in 533, acting in accordance

with the Pope John II. Bishop of Rome" as "some authority" for the phrase "GOD was crucified." Mr. Pace therefore stated that it is "Christians," not "the Church," who, "not properly" but "loosely and with no formal authority other than usage, do give and apply the name Jesus Xt. to the Son not-incarnate." I asked Mr. Pace, if, by those distinctions, he intended me to understand that "the Church" was entirely absolved from ever employing the inaccurate language of "popular religion": that, in all her *teaching*, she invariably deprecated and discouraged any departure from the Holy Scripture usage of the name JESUS CHRIST: that the whole of such discredit was attached to "Christians"; none to "the Church." Mr. Pace thereupon explained (Apl 13th 1909) that "Jesus Christ had become a name" for the Son *not-incarnate* in the early Christian era; that "the Church" is not "concerned" with *the name* JESUS CHRIST; that "there has never been a formal discussion and decision on the question of the application of *the name*"; then he cited "the decree of the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) which is universally recognised" wherein I should find "the *name* Jesus Christ referring to the Son not yet incarnate," and, for these reasons, he concluded: "the Church does not invariably hold and teach Jesus Christ is *never* God only." Your Grace is already informed that I twice wrote to Mr. Pace (Dec 21st Jany 14th) and subsequently to the Bishop of London (Feby 21st) inquiring which was the *positive* teaching implied in that *negative* statement: JESUS CHRIST is *always* GOD only, or JESUS CHRIST is *sometimes* GOD

only, and that no answer was accorded me. Their silence appeared to be due to their religious doubt and difficulty as to whether "always" or "sometimes" was the truth; but your Grace's letter now gives me to understand that Mr. Pace had exceeded his authority in thus even *negatively indicating*, as Mr. Gillson had done in *positively giving* such "final dicta." But though the Bishop of London and Mr. Pace did not define the meaning of that *negative* statement for "the Church" in "technical theology," Mr. Pace defined it for "Christians" in "popular religion." "Christians," Mr. Pace averred (Apl 13th 1909) do not erroneously declare in "popular religion": JESUS CHRIST is *always* GOD only; JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself; JESUS CHRIST is the Omnipotent Creator of the World. Asked if the Anglican Church inaccurately and unscripturally attributes the name, the acts and attributes of the Omnipotent Creator to JESUS CHRIST upon the authority of "the decree of the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) which is universally recognised," Mr. Pace wrote (Apl 19th 1909) intimating that neither that "decree" nor any other authority was needed for "so simple a proceeding," and presented an "*illustration*" of *Queen Victoria as affording all the authority and justification that is necessary*. The remarkable nature of that "*illustration*" can only be fully realized by a perusal of Mr. Pace's letter (a copy of that, or any other communication is, of course, still at your Grace's command) but, it will, I think, suffice to inform you that, among other things, it suggested that the "usual name" of GOD is JESUS CHRIST;

that since "the well known and common name" Queen Victoria is *inaccurately* given to the baby, or "the person," born May 24th 1819, he could see no difficulties in *inaccurately* giving "the well known and common name" JESUS CHRIST to "the person" GOD; further, it compared the *passing event* of a child being born on May 24th 1819, to the *permanent existence* of the Supreme Creator, and, from this premise, deduced that because Queen Victoria *was* born is true, therefore, JESUS CHRIST *is* GOD is true. Asked if I was to understand that this strange "illustration" had been advanced, *officially*, as the *sole* justification and authority for the avowedly unscriptural application of the name JESUS CHRIST to GOD, the Creator of the World, Mr. Pace determinedly resisted answering. He subjected me to every manner of excuse, and, ultimately, to a regrettable general charge of misrepresentation, wholly unwarranted, because unsupported by a single specific case. However, when I proposed laying this inquiry before the Bishop of London, Mr. Pace yielded the reply (Sept 22nd 1909) that his "illustration" was of his "own invention," occurring to him as a "useful parallel" and having "no official value."

Your Grace will now see that, coincidently with your own repudiation of authority for the "final dicta": "JESUS CHRIST is the Supreme Creator of the Universe, without any qualification"; "JESUS CHRIST had *not* human person," Mr. Pace, at last, officially abandoned the "decree" of Chalcedon and the "illustration" of Queen Victoria by which he had endeavoured to support and justify the "final

dicta": JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself; JESUS CHRIST is the Omnipotent Creator of the World, and also, apparently, JESUS CHRIST is *always* GOD only. But then, Mr. Pace abandoned such declarations only in the language of "technical theology": when speaking in the language of "popular religion" he seemed to feel himself at liberty to *teach* such "final dicta," *with neither official authority nor justification*, as the truth. I called Mr. Pace's attention to this apparent doctrinal anomaly, and solicited some light upon it, but nothing more was forthcoming from him, nor, indeed, from the Bishop of London, to whom I duly reported the salient points of Mr. Pace's statements.

Thus it was that I was compelled to appeal to your Grace for definite assurance upon this matter, as embodied in my inquiry No. 3.

None of my inquiries have been of a private nature, but, in every instance, dictated, as, almost at their inception, I stated, by my interest in Education. It is hardly conceivable that the Church of England regards it as desirable that little children should, at any time, be left in obscurity or confusion as to which language her official teachers employ when giving instruction upon these "great questions": accurate "technical theology," or inaccurate "popular religion." It is not clear, if, when Mr. Pace, on behalf of the Bishop of London, wrote: "— little children are, or at least should always be taught to affirm 'CHRIST is GOD' as 'but half the truth,'" he meant that little children are always taught that such statements as CHRIST

is GOD: JESUS CHRIST *is always GOD only: JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself: JESUS CHRIST is the Omnipotent Creator of the World, or JESUS CHRIST is the Supreme Creator of the Universe, without any qualification: JESUS CHRIST had not human person*, arise from the unscriptural use of the name JESUS CHRIST by early "Christians" and are now still pronounced in the inaccurate language of "popular religion"; not the accurate language of "technical theology";—yet, should that have been his meaning, strange as such a way of stamping the truth upon little children's minds appears, it seems to me it would be far better to so instruct them, than to withhold these facts from them, as they were, unfortunately, for so long a period, withheld from me. When, therefore, with deference to your Grace's immense daily work, I framed my inquiry No. 3, simply:—"Are little children always warned by the Church of England that to give and apply the name JESUS CHRIST to the Son *not-incarnate*, is, as avowed, *improper, loose, incorrect and unscriptural*; or, are they *not* always so warned?" it was in my anxiety to receive definite assurance from your Grace, as head of the Church, that their young and impressionable minds are never left, or, in the least led by the Church's official teachers, in "popular religion; not technical theology" to believe that such application is a *proper, strict, correct and Holy Scripture* usage.

Having received definite assurance from you with regard to my inquiries numbered 1 and 2, and again deploring that I should have had, at such great length, to convey to you the particular facts

which made necessary my inquiry No. 3, I now hope to also receive from your Grace, personally or by proxy, a specific answer to that inquiry.

I am, your Grace,

Obediently,

LAWRENCE STERNER.

LXXX.

(As from) Lambeth Palace, S.E.

Private.

28th May, 1910

Dear Sir,

The Archbishop of Canterbury directs me to say, in reply to your letter of May 25th, that he does not wish to add anything to what he wrote to you on the 2nd April. He notes that you quote certain phrases from his letter, but that you do not quote it in its entirety. It speaks for itself, and the Archbishop fears that with the multitude of duties daily devolving upon him he must leave the matter there so far as private correspondence is concerned. He takes all such opportunities as seem to him to be appropriate for dealing with theological questions in public teaching.

Yours faithfully,

ARTHUR SHEPPARD.

Private Secretary.

Lawrence Sterner, Esq.

LXXXI.

(Registered Letter)

"The Studio,"

61, Albany Street,
Regent's Park, N.W.

July 25th, 1910.

To His Grace
the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

My Lord Archbishop:

Since you, as head of the Church, have, in your reply to my last communication, again made no reference to my inquiry No. 3, it appears that the Church of England allows her officials to teach (as Mr. Gillson said, on June 5th, 1908: "*everywhere and at all times*" as "*the foundation truth*" of the Church; and, as Mr. Pace said, July 27th 08 and Apl 6th 09: "*of course when we are not speaking in technical theological language,*" but "*in the language of religion and worship*" or of "*popular religion*") that:—

CHRIST IS GOD.—Mr. Pace stated (July 6th 08) that this "doctrine" of "the foundation truth" of the Church is "not strictly accurate as regards *the exact words*"; also (July 27th 08) that it is an "unqualified statement" in which "the name Jesus Christ is not properly" applied, and which "you will not find in the Creeds."—The Bishop of London stated (Jany 22nd 09) that "it is but half the truth."

JESUS CHRIST is *always* GOD only.—Mr. Pace also left the inference that the Church teaches: JESUS CHRIST is *sometimes* GOD only; neither he nor the Bishop of London would give any reply to inquiries (Dec 21st 09; Jany 14th and

Feb'y 21st 10) as to which the Church teaches as the truth: JESUS CHRIST is *always* GOD only, or JESUS CHRIST is *sometimes* GOD only.

JESUS CHRIST is GOD Himself: JESUS CHRIST is the Omnipotent Creator of the World.—To sup-

port this teaching, in conjunction with JESUS CHRIST is *always* or *sometimes* GOD only, Mr. Pace explained (Apl 13th 09) that “ ‘ Jesus Christ ’ had become a name ” for the Son *not*-incarnate in the early Christian era; that “ the Church ” is not “ concerned ” with *the name* JESUS CHRIST, and that “ there has never been a formal discussion and decision on the question of the application of *the name* ”; he then cited the “ decree ” of Chalcedon; afterwards (Apl 19th 09) he implied that that “ decree ” is authoritatively unnecessary, and endeavoured to justify the teaching solely by means of the “ illustration ” of Queen Victoria; eventually, however, he said (Sept 22nd 09) that that “ illustration ” was of his “ own invention ” and “ has no official value.”

GOD died on the Cross; GOD was crucified.—

For the truth of this teaching Mr. Pace stated (Apl 13th 09) that the Pronouncement of “ the Emperor Justinian in 533 acting in accordance with the Pope John II., Bishop of Rome ” is “ some authority.”

JESUS CHRIST is the Supreme Creator of the Universe without any qualification; JESUS CHRIST HAD NOT HUMAN PERSON.—Your Grace stated, on

Apl 2nd, that these are "final dicta" which "neither the Archbishop of Canterbury nor anyone else" can give "of his own authority."

It more particularly appears that little children are not always informed that "the foundation truth" of the Church (which Mr. Pace said, on Apl 6th 09, they "are, or at least should always be taught to affirm" as "but half the truth") is pronounced by the Church's officials only when they are speaking inaccurately, in "the language" of "popular religion"; not when they are speaking accurately in "the language" of "technical theology":—that the impressionable minds of young children are led by the Church's official teachers, in "popular religion; not technical theology" to believe that the *avowedly improper, loose, incorrect, unscriptural* application of the name JESUS CHRIST to the SON *not-incarnate*, is a *proper, strict, correct* and *Holy Scriptural* usage.

The statements received on the subject from Mr. Gillson, Mr. Pace, the Bishop of London, and, finally, from yourself, altogether seem to indicate *official public teaching in two languages: one inaccurate; the other accurate*. When instructing little children in "THE FOUNDATION TRUTH" of RELIGION, the employment, by official teachers, of a "language" admittedly inaccurate, could not but subvert the Principles, and be prejudicial to the Advancement of the Science of Universal Education. It is difficult, therefore, to understand your statement that you "must leave the matter

there so far as private correspondence is concerned."

I take it for granted that your Grace can have no objection to my submitting *complete* copies of the correspondence to the Royal Society and to the Board of Education.

I am, your Grace,
Most obediently,
LAWRENCE STERNER.

* * * * *

May 25th, 1912.

N.B.—No reply having been received to the above *registered* letter, the correspondence is submitted "in its entirety" (with the Preface I have added) to the Royal Society, the Board of Education, and others who are responsible for Public Education.—In the Preface attention is drawn to recent declarations of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Balfour, M.P., and the Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman, M.P., laying stress on *the vital importance of Religion in Education to the National Welfare*; and to evidence that the INACCURATE "LANGUAGE" (nowhere found in Holy Scripture or the Creeds, in which "neither the Archbishop of Canterbury nor anyone else can, of his own authority, give final dicta") by the use of which it appears, from the answers sent me, "the Church allows" her ministers to equivocally teach young children to affirm "THE FOUNDATION TRUTH" of Religion "AS BUT HALF THE TRUTH," is a doctrinal latitude that is, by Royal Declaration and the Church's Articles, PROHIBITED within the British Realm.

LAWRENCE STERNER.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 035 867 1

